RESEARCH efforts in the important problem area of values may be categorized under two main headings—values and valuing. First, there are researchers who are interested in measuring values either in a pure research setting or for evaluation purposes. Examples of pure research efforts would include those studies of a cross-cultural nature or those using correlational techniques for establishing relationships between the values people hold and other relevant personal characteristics, e.g., sex, social class, college major, choice of profession, etc. Evaluation studies under this rubric are exemplified by Jacob's report (6) on the impact of college education on the values of college students and by the work currently under way at the University of Notre Dame in its Study of Catholic Education.

A second thrust by researchers in the area of values has been in the promotion of valuing. This school of thought, headed by Louis Raths (15; 16), is not concerned with the teaching of particular values but rather with the freeing of youngsters in the learning situation through the process of valuing. This group of research workers assesses the efficacy of its approach by measuring the effect the process of valuing has upon specific student behaviors. This column will discuss some of the methodological problems that seem rather characteristic to each of these research approaches.

Problems in Studies Concerned with Values

The overriding problem in studies concerned with values is of course one of measurement. For years, most studies in this area have relied upon the Allport-Vernon Study of Values (1). Subjects taking this test indicate preferences between carefully chosen alternatives. From the choices of a given subject, it is possible to indicate his relative value orientation in six areas: theoretical, economic, religious, political, aesthetic and social. While this inventory has been used quite extensively, researchers have long been wary of its validity. For example, Barton (3), in a criticism of Jacob's work, raises serious question about whether this instrument can really measure values.

In the past few years, many researchers have cast about for alternatives to the Study of Values for use in research studies concerned with the measurement of values. Dilley (4) reported a measuring technique making use of a paired-comparison scale. He paired seventeen items, e.g., having $10,000 at one time; owning a home of your own; freedom; and solitude. Subjects were presented with these pairs and asked in a forced-choice sense...
to select the one of the two items they would prefer. In this report Dilley includes an additional reference that may be helpful for those interested in finding out more about this technique.

A second innovation for assessing values is the Osgood Semantic Differential Scale. Winter(18) investigated the relationships between instructors' values, students' values and student achievement in general psychology. His study made use of the evaluative scale of Osgood's instrument and 15 concepts were judged by subjects on a continuum from good to bad. Other instruments for assessing particular values include the Inventory of Beliefs (2) which gauges subjects' tendencies toward ideocentrism, ethnocentrism, sociocentrism and egocentrism and Prince's (11) Differential Values Inventory, which places students' values along a continuum ranging from the emergent to the traditional in value orientation. Finally, some researchers have developed morality tests to measure the degree to which subjects will choose "correct" responses in hypothetical situations. Getzels' and Jackson's (5) work in this area is perhaps most typical.

While the validity of any measure is difficult to verify, it is exceedingly difficult in this area. This fact is apparently true for two reasons: (a) there is no respected reference point to which newer measures can be compared in the area of values. This is in contrast to the respect and esteem that individual intelligence tests enjoy in the area of ability testing; and (b) there are no hypothetical constructs giving some direction to the establishment of construct validity for tests in the values area. Needless to say, the validity of all the measures of values mentioned in this column is open to question.

Teachers and researchers may find some help in the measurement area in the long awaited work of Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia, The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook II, The Affective Domain (9). The first part of the taxonomy concerned with the cognitive domain has been so widely used in schools around the world that educators may feel that equally effective guides for measurement would be forthcoming from this same source. There is a danger of prejudging a book that is not yet available for careful reading but it appears that Krathwohl et al. were faced with a dilemma in values research that they were unable to resolve.

If values are important and crucial aspects of the affective domain; if values are truly generalized and habitual systems operating within a personality; if values, in other words, are rather permanent and significant determiners of behavior to the extent that they merit our inspection and concern, then clearly it must take more than an abortive nod or a flick of a pencil to assess them. Some indicators of commitment must be observed and assessed if measurements are to be valid. More specifically, the dilemma is that by taking a reasonable definition of value as a basis for devising measuring instruments, we almost preclude the use of group pencil and paper tests. On the other hand, as we choose to use group paper and pencil tests as operational definitions of values, we are almost forced to consider values as rather shallow and transient and unworthy of serious concern.

A final methodological problem in research in the values area is one of sampling. This problem in research design has been stressed again and again as crucial to external validity. Most of the studies reported in the literature used convenience samples rather than random
samples from some well defined populations. Of course it must be added that this complaint is one that may be levied against most research in the social sciences today including the studies to be reported in the following paragraphs. However, when researches are merely of a pulse-taking variety and where no particular treatments are applied over a period of time, it could be hoped that more care would be taken in the sampling procedure.

Problems in Studies Concerned with Valuing

Louis Raths (16) has put forth a theory having to do with valuing that posits the notion that certain behaviors are characteristic of children who lack values. These behaviors include overconforming, underachieving, apathy, flightiness, dissenting, uncertainty and role-playing. He hypothesizes that as youngsters have a chance to undergo the process of valuing, these behaviors will wane. Teachers may help children with this process in rather specific ways, (14). While there have been quite a number of researchers testing these ideas, unfortunately very few of their reports are in print (7; 8; 12; 13; 17).

As in the research dealing with values, there are methodological problems inherent in these researches. First, the studies testing hypotheses in valuing involved a treatment that was administered to a group of children over a rather long period of time. This necessity introduced the factor of an “impure” application of the experimental conditions needed to fairly and adequately test the valuing hypotheses. Many times teachers found it difficult to allow children to undergo the valuing process. That studies were contaminated by an inadequate or inconsistent application of the experimental treatment may be more of a reflection on the researchers than on the teachers. The rationale of the valuing concept is a difficult one to convey. Also, as not one of the studies was funded, lack of resources limited the amount of supervision and direction that researchers could provide to the teachers during the studies.

Second, the studies focusing on valuing also had a problem in measurement as did the studies in the values area mentioned previously. For instance, how can a student’s degree of conformity be assessed? Various techniques have been used: self-rating scales, teacher rating scales, peer-rating scales, and the use of trained observers for rating purposes. There has been no effort to check the reliability or validity of these ratings. To truly and effectively test hypotheses of the valuing theory put forth by L. Raths, more careful attention must be paid to the measurement problem in the research designs.

In summary, if it is any comfort to those of us in education concerned with valuing, it is a fact that the Russians are having trouble in this field too. One Russian teacher, Netylik (10), profoundly announced in a recent issue of Soviet Education that “the teaching of atheistic views is a complex process and anti-religious measures do not have the same effect on all children.” As terrifying as these conclusions may be to us, we may soon be approaching the point when we will attempt to teach specific values (hopefully different ones than the Russians are trying to teach) to American youngsters. Do we want to become effective in teaching specific values? Or do we want to become effective in promoting valuing? This is a question that research data cannot an-
answer but one each of us must face up to
as, at breakneck speed, we approach
1984.
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(Continued from page 490)
practices of society, it is for us to change
them. Any other course is an impotency
deny ing our power to act upon the cur-
rents of time and to exercise our influ-
ence upon the waves of change.
To be, then, is static, a mere tolerance
of status quo. Our goal ought to manifest
itself in becoming, in growing, in reach-
ing out toward purposes of our own mak-
ing, rather than mere conformity to
 standards toward which we have made
no contribution. If our society is to prog-
ress, this must be the responsibility of
all agents of our culture, the school being
a dominant one.
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